29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

The hour of four having arrived, the First Special Session will please come to order. Will the Members please be at their desks. Will our guests in the galleries please rise for the prayer. The prayer today will be given by Senator Adeline Jay Geo-Karis. Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

(Prayer by Senator Adeline Jay Geo-Karis)

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Reading of the Journal.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Journals of the First Special Session for Wednesday, November 3rd; Thursday, November 4th; Monday, November 8th; and Wednesday, November 10th, 1993.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Mr. -- Mr. President, I move that the Journals just -- just read by the Secretary be approved, unless some Senator has additions or corrections to offer.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Butler moves to approve the Journals just read. There being no objections, so ordered. Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Mr. President, I move that reading and approval of the Journals of Friday, November 12th, and Saturday, November 13th, in the year 1993, be postponed, pending arrival of the printed Journals.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Butler moves to postpone the reading and the approval of the Journal, pending the arrival of the printed transcript. There being no objections, so ordered. Senator Donahue, for what

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

purpose do you rise?

SENATOR DONAHUE:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. I rise to request a Republican Caucus immediately in Senator Pate Philip's Office. A Republican Caucus.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Thank you, Senator Donahue. Senator Cullerton, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I would respectfully ask for a Democratic Caucus to convene in Senator Jones' Office, and this would be in one-half hour, 4:45.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

All right. Thank you, Senator. The Senate will stand at ease until the -- both the Republican and Democrat Caucuses are over.

(SENATE STANDS AT EASE)

(SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

The Special Session will please come to order. Messages from the House.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Message from the House by Mr. Rossi, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has concurred with the Senate in the passage of a bill of the following title, to wit:

Senate Bill 132 with House Amendments 1 and 4.

Passed the House, as amended, November 14th, 1993, by a

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

three-fifths vote.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

There's been a request to videotape our proceedings today from Channel -- WCIA-TV, Channel 5-WMAQ, and WICS, and the Associated Press. Leave granted? Leave is granted. Senator Weaver, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR WEAVER:

Thank you, Mr. President. There'll be a Rules Committee meeting in the anteroom in about five minutes.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Thank you, Senator Weaver. The Senate will stand at ease -- whoop -- the Senate will stand at ease until the Rules Committee reports back to the Secretary.

(SENATE STANDS AT EASE)

(SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

The Senate will please come to order. We've had two more requests for filming our proceedings: WFLD-TV, WGN-TV. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Messages.

SECRETARY HARRY:

A Message from the President.

Dear Mr. Secretary - Pursuant to Senate Resolution 3, I hereby appoint Senators Hasara, Maitland and Watson to the Committee to Approve the Senate Journals of the First Special Session of the 88th General Assembly.

We have a like communication from Senator Jones, Minority Leader, appointing Senators Carroll and Severns.

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Committee Reports.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senator Weaver, Chair of the Committee on Rules, reports the following Legislative Measures be approved for consideration: the motion to concur with House Amendments 1 and 4 to Senate Bill 132. PRESIDENT PHILIP:

...(machine cutoff)...Senate Calendar, First Special Session, Supplemental No. 1, Senate Bill 132. Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. First, I would like to have leave to add Senator Watson to a -- as a hyphenated cosponsor to Senate Bill 132.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

All right. Senator Jacobs asks if Senator Watson can be put on as a cosponsor. Is there leave? Leave is granted.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

On Supplemental Calendar No. 1, on the Order of Concurrence, is Senate Bill 132. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

I move to concur with the House in their adoption of Amendments 1 and 4 to Senate Bill 132.

Filed by Senator Jacobs.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

...you. Thank you...(microphone malfunction)...and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. As you indicated, we do desire to accept Amendment 1 and Amendment No. 4. Amendment No. 1 -- excuse me, Amendment No. 4 becomes the bill. And what this bill originally started out to be was a technical change which changed the terminology of "handicapped child" to a "child with disabilities",

November 14, 1993

you can see, this amendment has grown to some length to where it now has become the Chicago school bill. With that, Mr. President, I'm not going to stand here and debate the issues. going to let everyone else debate the merits of the upstate and the downstate issue, debate the merits of rightness or wrongness, Democrat or Republican, the merits of Title I, the merits of the financial gap in two years. I'm not going to do that. I'm going to defer to Senator Berman in just a second. But I do have one thing, as sponsor of the bill I guess I have the prerogative to do, and to let you know that the issue here, in my estimation, is education, and the -- and the issue is kids. And I hope we have learned a lesson through this process, which I think has been disdainful to all of us. I think that we must. And what we have learned today is that we all talk about education being our number one priority. We have went through the process. I think that if we have learned anything, the number one priority has got to Next year I would hope that we will address the issue education. of education and the issue of quality education for all and make it our number one priority early in the Session and then fund those things that are left over. With that, I defer to Senator Berman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeANGELIS)

WBBM-TV wishes to have leave to photograph the Session. Do we have leave? Leave's granted. Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Let me try to cover some of the details of Senate Bill 132, as amended, or as proposed to be amended. I would suggest that this bill now be called "The Chicago Funding and Reform Bill", because that is exactly what it does in addressing the needs of the Chicago School System to be able to open its doors tomorrow morning, and at the same time, to institute a number of

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

changes in the operations of the Chicago School System.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeANGELIS)

Can we please have some attention.

SENATOR BERMAN:

In the area of financing, this bill involves no appropriation other allocation of any State money to increase the current State aid allocation to the Chicago schools. What this bill does do is to allow three hundred and seventy-eight million dollars in borrowing over the next two years: a hundred and seventy-five million in this current Fiscal Year of 1994, and two hundred and three million dollars the following year in Fiscal '95. This bill provides no borrowing from the Teachers' Pension System borrowing from the Teachers' Pension System. The allocation of State Chapter 1 monies provides for an increase in the next two years of eighteen million dollars, more than what was appropriated to Chicago last year; however, this eighteen million dollars is less than what was hoped to have been appropriated. But there should be no mistake that the eighteen million dollars is an increase in the amount that would have -- was appropriated last year under State Chapter 1 monies. Chapter 1 allocations in Fiscal Year 1994 will total two hundred and forty-nine million dollars, and I think that's very important to recognize; that two hundred and forty-nine million dollars of State Chapter 1 money comes from Springfield and goes to local schools in Chicago. not go to Pershing Road. It goes to local schools based upon their Chapter 1 student count. Poor children get this money based upon their count in each school that they attend. In the area of reforms, this bill eliminates the permanent job guarantee for supernumerary teachers and eliminates the category supernumerary teachers. It creates an Inspector General appointed by the School Finance Authority to monitor Board expenditure practices. It requires the School Finance Authority to conduct

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

management audits of the Board every two years, and requires the Board to develop a staffing plan and receive School Finance Authority approval of that plan. After the expiration of the current teachers' contract, which is ready to be signed if this approved -- so that on August 31, 1995, it will allow bill is school building personnel in Chicago to waive work rules by a vote of fifty-one percent of that school personnel, instead of the present requirement, which is -- which is seventy-two percent, I believe. It places the principal in charge of all school utilizing the existing contract language between the Board and the It allows principals to approve contracts of up to ten thousand dollars, with the endorsement of the local school council. It provides for the immediate release of reserve teachers who have been rated unsatisfactory, and that -- it should be noted that principals have the responsibility to evaluate reserve teachers, as they have the responsibility of evaluating all teachers, and if they are determined to be they will be undertaken into a process unsatisfactory, of elimination. It allows the Board to fill teaching positions which have been vacant for at least sixty days with a properly certified reserve teacher. Requires a reserve teacher who holds an unneeded certificate to pursue, and must obtain within twenty school months, a certificate in an area of need in the Chicago Public School System. Allows them to be assigned on an interim basis by the Board of Education, so that you will have qualified teachers teaching in these classrooms. And it requires the school -school -- the School Finance Authority to approve the Board's budget by August 15th, two weeks earlier, rather than August 31st In addition, it authorizes the Board of Education of each year. the City Council to place a tax referendum for an increase in the school tax authority on the ballot between January 1st and July 1st of 1995. It opens a second window of opportunity for

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

early retirement for Chicago teachers next year, 1994. And it sets up a schedule so that the schools will remain open while the Board and the School Finance Authority take the necessary steps to adopt the budget provided for under Senate Bill 132 and Amendment No. 4. I'd be glad to respond to questions, Mr. President, at the appropriate time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

For what purpose does Senator Philip seek recognition? SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate.

A point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

State your point.

SENATOR PHILIP:

We -- we have the Chief Executive's wife here this evening, Brenda Edgar. Would she please rise and be recognized by the Senate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeANGELIS)

Any further discussion? Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Will the speaker yield for questioning?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Speaker says he will.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Yes. Senator Berman, I understand you to say that there are no dollars from the State coffers which are going for this proposal.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeANGELIS)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

That's correct. There are no State dollars involved in Senate

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

Bill 132, Amendment 4.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeANGELIS)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Senator Berman, when the powers to be sat down at the table and negotiated this new plan, when they sat there and decided that the pensioners were going to be bailed out and they weren't going to use their funds, that they were going to borrow an additional one hundred and ten million dollars, was there any discussion to borrow more than that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Senator Trotter, I was not around the table. I -- I will defer to Senator Jones to comment on that at the appropriate time. I am advised that, yes, that was one of the issues as to whether additional borrowing should be authorized so that Chapter 1 monies might not be diverted.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeANGELIS)

Senator Jones, did you want to say something? Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

...(microphone cutoff)...my question to Senator Jones. Senator Jones, what was the rationale not to borrow additional dollars for -- to -- so we would not have to take the dollars - the Chapter 1 dollars - from the kids versus borrowing a hundred and ten million? It seems like it would have been logical if we could have borrowed maybe a hundred and thirty-four million or a hundred and forty-four million versus just a hundred and ten to save the pensioners.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Jones.

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

SENATOR JONES:

Well -- well, Senator Trotter, in response to your question, I too wanted to increase the borrowing. This -- this concept came from the Republican side of the aisle in order for them to -- felt they needed to put Members on here to vote, so I, in turn, indicated that I wanted to do more borrowing to deal with the Chapter 1. Unfortunately, we could not accomplish that objective. So, it didn't come from this side; it came from that side, in -- in our attempt to get thirty-six votes to keep the schools open in the City of Chicago.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Okay. The dollars that we're shifting from the children then — and we all —— I think everyone here by now knows what the Chapter 1 dollars are supposed to do; that they were those dollars that were given up in 1988 so that those children who went to disadvantaged schools can get parity in their —— in their system — well, these dollars are now being diverted. Can anyone tell me what those dollars are being diverted to?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

As the author of that legislation, Senator Trotter, we did a five-year phase-in - internal phase-in - of shifting dollars to -- to targeted schools where you had high enrollment of children from disadvantaged families. As Senator Berman pointed out, this is the last year of the phase-in. So, therefore, instead of getting a thirty-two-million-dollar increase this year, they will get a eighteen-million-dollar increase this year and a -- and a sixteen-million-dollar increase or more next year. So -- but the money that they already have, they keep those dollars, and -- and

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

this is in addition to. So, therefore, it is a very high-percentage increase at a time when we are scraping the barrel -- or the bottom of the barrel to get dollars to run the Chicago School System.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeANGELIS)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

I'm not going to belabor the point. It's seemingly here that we had become confused in our role as legislators, that role, for one, in protecting our school system, was to ensure that those children -- that the children were taken care of first. Seemingly what we have done here in this -- in this legislative Body is that we've had one party ensure that the principals and that the pensioners are taken care of, and then we have the Democrats over in the House ensuring that the school district -excuse me, the Chicago school teachers are taken care of, but no one is standing up for the children. I mean, these dollars specifically were earmarked to give children a chance to become on par with those other school districts that have had more dollars coming into their districts throughout the years. Seemingly by us diverting those dollars, we are now breaking down what we've actually tried to put together. It is by fact that these dollars have gone to these schools and there's been some good things that reading scores have gone up, that math scores have gone up. To take those dollars, be it sixteen million dollars or eighteen million dollars, again, is an unconscionable thing that we should not be playing into. I believe what we see going on here today is We have a lot of great pretenders a -- a game of pretension. pretending that this is for the children, and that is not true; pretending that this is the answer to our school problem is far from true; pretending that we're not going to have this problem again immediately next year. That's unconscionable.

November 14, 1993

We, today, should be taking a vote to ensure that the children are taken care of and not by passing this kind of legislation which is going to hurt the children more than help them. We should be looking at this program and do what Article X of our Constitution has mandated all of us to do, and that's to take care and pay the majority of the funding and the finances for our schoolchildren. This is a -- a very badly flawed bill. It's not good for the people of Illinois. It's -- definitely not good for our children, and I'm going to vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Fitzgerald.

SENATOR FITZGERALD:

Will the speaker yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Speaker says he will.

SENATOR FITZGERALD:

Senator Berman, I had a question concerning the meaning of certain language on page 25 of the bill, on line 28. It says "Tax levy", if you can find the language.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR FITZGERALD:

It -- it -- let me, if I could...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Oh, I'm sorry.

SENATOR FITZGERALD:

It says, "Before or at the time of issuing any Bonds, the Authority shall provide by resolution for the levy and collection of a direct annual tax", and then it goes on - sufficient to pay and discharge the interest and the principals on the bonds. I have two questions. It seems to me that what this means is that the School Finance Authority will itself have the power to levy

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

the tax. And under the previous language, the School Finance Authority directed the City Council to issue -- to levy the tax. And now, this appears to give the School Finance Authority the qua. So, I have two questions. One, is that what it means, that the School Finance Authority has such -- such -- such power? And two, can the Finance Authority, which is an unelected body, levy a tax? Is that constitutional?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeANGELIS)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you. To give a little bit of history: When the School Finance Authority acted under the original language, a question came up as to what the authority was of the City Council. And you look at the wording of the -- of the old bill, it said that the School Finance Authority shall, quote, "demand and direct the City Council". It -- the interpretation has been, for the thirteen-plus years that the Finance Authority has been in effect, that the City's -- Council's action was not discretionary - they couldn't say no - that they were there to -- to do what the School Finance Authority requested them to do, or directed them to do. And that's the word: direct. In order to eliminate confusion, we've taken that language out. There have been debates on the floor of the City Council: Why do we, the City Council, That's the have to vote for something when we can't vote No? reason we've done -- we've taken that language out. They didn't have the -- they did not have the discretion to vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Fitzgerald.

SENATOR FITZGERALD:

So this does mean, as I read it, that funding will be provided for the repayment of the principal and interest on these bonds by the levying of a -- of a property tax. And so, the concern about

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

how these bonds will be repaid is -- is answered right here: They will be repaid by the levy of additional property taxes by the School Finance Authority.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

The -- the General Assembly has authorized a property tax levy to the School Finance Authority. This legislation does not increase that levy. Within the framework of that levy, the School Finance Authority - in other words, without increasing real estate taxes - the School Finance Authority will be able to float and pay off these bonds.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeANGELIS)

Senator Tom Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I guess what bothers me about this bill is the fact that we're addressing a subject in a piecemeal fashion, a subject that very dearly needs to be addressed in its We're really not getting down to the heart of the problems of education. There's really nothing innovative in this for the children of our State, for the children that can't read, for dropouts, for those that desperately need it. And what better subject could we spend some time in, or on, than debating a subject that applies to all of Illinois, rather than one school district? My district is probably like yours: Referendums fail, real estate taxes are high, and we desperately need dollars to is an opportunity, I think, that's invest in children. This by, unfortunately. This piecemeal approach education will not benefit the children; it won't stem crime; won't make children have higher ACT scores. But I'm afraid the answer is not to shut down the school system tomorrow, and I would gather that -- that many legislators are torn between trying to

November 14, 1993

take advantage of an opportunity to really do something, as happened with the income tax a number of years ago, and this opportunity. The choice, unfortunately, is not very clear. It is extremely difficult to vote against four hundred and some thousand children who desperately need a place to go and be safe every day of their lives, a place where many children go every day and their best meal. It's not easy for me to vote for this bill when in the last ten days a school referendum failed not only in my district, but in the school district that I grew up in. So these choices are not easy, and we have to look at them on balance, And in this case, I'm going to give the benefit unfortunately. not to the City of Chicago, not to the Finance Authority; going to give the benefit to the teachers who I think work very hard for not a lot of money - in a combat zone, many times. And in this case, I'm also going to give the children the benefit of the doubt. I don't hear a lot of people speaking for the benefit of the children, as often happens. So in this instance, I'm going to vote Yes for this bill, and take a chance.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeANGELIS)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Will the -- will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeANGELIS)

Sponsor says he will.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Taking up what Senator -- taking up what Senator -- the former Senator spoke about, on the taxing ability of the Finance Committee. You are saying that there is a levy that the School Finance Committee has that will be used to pay these bonds back. My understanding is, right now, nineteen cents of that is being used to pay for old bonds, thirty-one cents is to be -- is being used to pay for operations. You are talking about taking that

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

thirty-one cents, then, and paying the new bonds off. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

A portion of the thirty-one cents, yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Can you tell me, is that going to be enough money over those fourteen years to pay these bonds back without coming back to Springfield and asking us to raise income tax or asking the State to -- to pay for part of this? Can you guarantee that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Can I guarantee it? No, Senator Berman cannot guarantee it, but I will give you this answer: that according to the best minds in public finance, this is sufficient to pay off this bond, based upon current interest rates and projected interest rates.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

One more question. After we have taken this thirty-one cents or -- or a portion of that thirty-one cents, who pays for the operations? Somewhere along the line we are shorting someone.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Is that a question, Senator Fawell? Senator Berman, who's going -- who's going to get shorted?

SENATOR BERMAN:

The calculation of the bond issue builds in the -- what we call the difference tax, in order to address the shortfall for the

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

next two fiscal years.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

And after that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Berman. Senator Fawell, if that's a question, would you state it as such. Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

What happens after the two years? Where is the cliff?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Well, the -- the financing process -- there is enough money to pay for the bonds through the levy authorization to the School Finance Authority. The projected borrowing is enough to meet the demands of the Chicago operating needs for the next two years. What happens after that is the same question I will ask as to the hundred and twelve other school districts that are on the -- Financial Watch List: How do they meet their budget? I don't have that answer.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

So for -- in other words, there is a cliff: my -- my point.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. I regrettably rise in support of this bill, not because of the -- the content of the bill itself or the purpose for which the bill was drafted - most of the provisions in this bill. As to the

November 14, 1993

merits of this bill, I guess I would have to say -- take the advice of my mother that says, "If you can't say anything good about it, don't say nothing", and there's very little in this bill that I can say something good about. But I'm going to support this bill because it would pain me more and I don't know how I can tell the children of the City of Chicago that I voted today not to allow the schools to open. It's time to put an end to that speculation so that the children can feel a sense of securities in their classrooms, and so that the teachers and principals and those who are responsible for the education and administration of the school system in Chicago can get down to the business of planning, to fill the vacancies that -- that are needed to filled because of the early retirement, and -- and get down to business of programming so that our -- our seniors can graduate and go on and be able to pass the tests and enter into college, and so that the little children underage and their parent can feel secure that tomorrow they don't have to leave work or not have go to school or do other things that they know that they will have to make provisions for caring for their children tomorrow and thereafter, and maybe even indefinite. I'm voting for this bill because I don't know how to explain to them that the Title I money is very important, in which it is for poor children, that sixteen million dollars, this year. I don't know if they would outweigh that, in terms of whether or not we would rely upon the -- the -that side of the aisle to make an informed decision if we vote this bill down, to go back to the table and negotiate a settlement that we can get on about the business. So the way -- the reason I'm voting for this bill, because of stone coercion. it's like being between the rock and the hard place. Either I vote for the bill tonight, or I suffer the consequences. The children will suffer the consequences, if I don't. And for that reason, I -- I rise in support of this bill.

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, this is the longest time we've been in Session in the twenty-one years that I've served both the House and the Senate. These are items we should have cleaned up some time ago, but finally we got an agreement between both sides, I hope. I want to commend the Governor, and I want to commend our four Leaders - Senator Philip, Senator Jones, Representative Madigan and Representative Daniels for staying and putting many, many hours to arrive at some sort of a meaningful compromise. You want to talk about more money for the students. I certainly want to see the children go to school tomorrow. I have always voted in favor of -- compulsory binding arbitration for the police and firemen. I would do it for school people too, because then the teachers are not out of pay; the children are in school while the negotiations continue; however, this is the bill before us. Three things I like about this bill: One is, we do not rob the pension funds. I have had many, many letters against taking any money of the pension -- out of the pension funds for operating expenses. Two, we will have an Inspector General, which means, really, an efficiency expert. Inspector General will have the authority to conduct This investigations into allegations of or incidence of waste, fraud and financial mismanagement in public education. When all of this found out, there's going to be far, far more money to spend educating the children, instead of putting it to waste sweetheart contracts of consultation. And the third thing, teachers can have early retirement - the Chicago teachers - by -if they -- as long as they apply for it by March 1, 1994. So, therefore, if there isn't any need for some of them, they will be retired, and we can still save money. I certainly endorse

November 14, 1993

concept of this bill. We are not giving any State money. And I just want to say to the Chicago people, what you need to do is start worrying ahead how to pay your bills, have your referendums just like we have them in our areas. So, I -- I certainly speak in favor of this bill and ask everyone to endorse it, and let's get on with it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

May I -- may I remind everyone that there are quite a few speakers. Please limit your comments to as short as possible. Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield for a few questions?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Sponsor says he will.

SENATOR HENDON:

I'd like to know which one I'm speaking to. Senator Rea -- Berman. I'm sorry. I know...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

They all look like, Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

They do all look alike on this plan. To be perfectly honest, I think it's very masterful to have the Democrats carry this bad bill because it makes it awful difficult for those of us who some οf the support the Democratic Party to point out and some of the travesties related to inefficiencies particular bill, and -- and it's a Democrat that has to answer the questions. So I apologize to my distinguished colleagues, but on this bill, Republicans, Democrats, everybody supporting it, does look alike to me. Senator Berman, the Chapter 1 dollars - and I know you're very familiar with those dollars - in your opinion, have these dollars done anything positively to improve the quality

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

of education in the Chicago public schools?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Very much so.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

In your going around the City, I'm sure you've talked to a lot of local school councils and, perhaps, principals. Have they indicated to you either way - good or bad - the -- the effect of taking these Chapter 1 dollars are going to have on their schools? Have they -- have they indicated to you that they've had an increase in test scores and -- and things of that nature since they were provided these Chapter 1 dollars, and have they indicated to you what they feel would be the result of taking away these dollars?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

I've had many discussions with many principals and many teachers, and as I indicated before, Chapter 1 dollars are -- have been put to a very good use, and that was documented earlier this year with the report evaluating Chicago School Reform. But let me just respectfully suggest to you, when you say taking away dollars, this bill does not take away dollars; it adds more money for every child. Every child that's a Chapter 1 child in Chicago will get more money next year than it got this year. It doesn't reach the level of expectation that we had hoped, but it does not decrease.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Hendon.

November 14, 1993

SENATOR HENDON:

Well, I'd like to turn your attention to this bill, and I and I do want to make for the record the fact that I am appalled that we just received this a few minutes before you asked us And I believe that our Senate Rules, one of the vote for it. first things that our honorable President, President passed, Senate Rule No. 3, was that we would get things in a timely manner so that all Senators would be able to respond to any legislation, having had the opportunity to read this. we haven't had the opportunity to read this, then you can't tell me, and no one in here can tell me, everything that's because it just got here. Now, I would like for you to turn your attention, Senator Berman, to the Section here that says that the Chapter 1 dollars will be reduced by sixteen million. Now, reduced means a reduction. Reduced means -- it says "reduced" Now, if I -- if I have to show you page and here in the bill. verse, I'll do that, but it says "reduced by sixteen million". Now, I understand what you're saying, that, "Well, they're getting more than they had last year." Well, let me say this: I have -my son is in Marshall right now. So I have children in Chicago public schools. So I know from whence I speak. I speak from within my heart on this issue. The Chicago public schools are in bad shape. I agree with my Republican colleagues on that. They are in terrible shape. Finally, our great Leader, Senator Jones, came up with a way to kind of make things a little bit better, and that's known as State Chapter 1. So as soon as things began to get a little bit better and as soon as they saw that the schools were going to get a little more money, you come and take So you cannot convince me, by any hook or crook, or kind of way that you do the language, that the Chapter 1 dollars are not being taken from our schools. So, I will leave that one alone, because you can -- you can -- you can sugarcoat this thing,

November 14, 1993

you can put chocolate on it, you can put white sugar on it - all right? - it's still a low-down, rotten bill, and taking away the Chapter 1 dollars is a low-down, sneaky thing to do. And if you want to know why they took the Chapter 1 dollars, I'll tell Because it's easy to pick on the poor children. It's easy to pick on the poor. You always take the path of least and the path of least resistance are the poor children. And it bothers me, Mr. -- Mr. President, for people get up here and say, "We're doing this for the children." You're for the children; you're doing this to not doing this there is a big, big difference - there is a clear children. And difference - with what you're doing to the children of schools. Now, there are a lot of villains in this mess - a lot of villains - and I won't go into who all each of them are because they know who they are. You know who you are if you're one of and I don't care which side of the aisle you sit on. We've known that these we've been working on this thing now. schools were in crises for quite some time - almost a year. But they wait until the last second, the very last minute, they can force a bad bill down our throats - a bad bill. leader, Senator Trotter, said it fine. Somebody looked out the Teachers' Pension Fund, and that's all right because I did not support them taking the money from the Pension Fund either. after the teachers voted to do it, I said, "Well, if they want do it, fine." I understand the retirees didn't get a chance to vote on that matter. But somebody looked out for them. Somebody looked out for the Board. Somebody looked out for the Mayor. Somebody looked out for the Governor. But who's going to look out for these poor children? And I don't mind wearing this jacket. I've had many of my colleagues -- "Oh, Hendon, you going to wear this jacket tomorrow, 'cause we going to go out there while you're running for reelection and say you voted against the poor kids."

November 14, 1993

Well, let me tell you something: The people of my district and the people of this City are not stupid. They're very intelligent. They can read. They understand a bad deal when they see it. They can smell a rat when they smell this rat. This is a low-down, dirty, sneak attack on the children of the City of Chicago. And you want to say to them, "Yeah. But the schools are open." But a generic education, my friends. A generic, watered-down, unnutritious education is no education at all. And taking away these Chapter 1 dollars is giving our children a generic education. And I'm telling you, the children of Chicago cannot compete with the rest of the State, the rest of the county and the rest of this world with this watered-down, bland, generic education that you want to offer them today.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Questions of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeANGELIS)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR PALMER:

Senator Berman, just a few questions to clarify on the -- the Chapter 1. I'm looking, to start with, at page 56, line 11, beginning with "For the 1993-94 school year". Could you clarify that and tell me if I understand this correctly? That a local school council may approve an amended budget for its schools in which supplemental State Chapter 1 funds may be used to restore and support regular and basic programs. Is that saying that the Board now cannot take that money away from the schools? Am I understanding that correctly?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeANGELIS)

Senator Berman. Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

November 14, 1993

Let me explain that language, and I'm not sure that it answers your question, but let me tell you what this language is for. There was a concern that -- that Pershing Road has cut a number of programs. A number of local school councils wanted to be able use Chapter 1 based upon their local determination to provide those programs; however, the other side of that same coin was that you allowed without limitation the Chapter 1 money substitute for programs, that might be an invitation to Pershing Road to make other cuts, tapping in on Chapter 1 money that ought to be used to help the poor children. This language on page 56, lines 5 through 18 - the purpose of this is to limit the discretion - no, let me change that - to authorize a local school council to use its Chapter 1 funds to replace any programs it sees fit, including ones that were terminated before this year; so that programs that the local school council thinks is important and they want to provide it, the local school council has that discretion, but we made it based upon programs cut previously. will not apply for any programs cut from this point forward, SO that we are not inviting Pershing Road to make cuts relying on the use of Chapter 1 money.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you. So, I'm to understand that that's a kind of protection for local school councils. Second question: Local -- as I understand it, local school councils get to keep the Chapter 1 dollars that carried over from the previous year. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

That's untouched. That's correct.

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Okay. The third question: As I read one of the charts that we have, and I want to clarify this -- yes -- no. The school-by-school gains and so forth, as I understand it - and I think you've said this before but I just want to make it clarified on the Floor - that children receive Chapter 1 dollars based on their application - completed application, signed by parents - through the lunch, or whatever, program. This is not based on census figures. Secondly, that some schools have lost children in this count. Is that correct? So that when we look across at this chart - I know you can't see it from here, but this is the one we received a few weeks ago - some schools lost children anyway and lost Chapter 1 dollars anyway, is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Yes. You know, the Chapter 1 children are -- are the poorest children in our school system. At the same time, they also have a very high degree of mobility. They move from school to school. So in any situation, regardless of what's happening to Chapter 1 money, School A, where some of its Chapter 1 children may leave, they're going to lose some dollars. That is not changed by this process.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeANGELIS)

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you. And am I to understand, Senator Berman -- I was reading the Section on principals in charge, and you may remember that about a year or so ago, you and Senator Collins and a number of us spent a long period of time in the corridor on the other

November 14, 1993

side of the hall doing shuttle diplomacy on this principals in charge. It was one of the very hot issues of that Session. Does the Section in here, in this bill, strengthen the principals' authority over the operating engineers, who are the janitors in the schools and the food service people?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Yes. As a result of contract negotiations, the power of the principal has improved and that language has been incorporated in this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

A comment to the bill: I'm not going to make any sanctimonious statements about this bill. It is not one that if I had my druthers, as my mother used to say, I would vote for; however, it is going to be a utilitarian vote under pressure from forces that have frequently proven themselves intractable when it comes to providing adequate and equitable support to the children in Chicago's public schools. I will leave it at that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Will the House Members quit trying to influence the Senators on the Floor and keep the noise down? Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. And, first of all, I'd like to preface my remarks by congratulating the Governor of this State, Jim Edgar, in his leadership in maintaining the four Leaders, together, over a period of time, by which some sort of an agreement could be reached. A lot of criticism has been focused on the Governor, and I think that's been unwarranted and unfounded, and certainly what we have here tonight, and hopefully

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

I also want to thank our its passage, will dictate that. And Leader, Senator Pate Philip, who took the message to the Second Floor and to the other Leaders of his caucus, and we didn't get everything that we wanted, as neither did Senator Jones, took the messages that many of you gave to him down to the Second Floor in the debate with the Governor and the other Leaders. Wе didn't get everything we wanted, and neither did Senator Jones. So any criticism of either of our Leaders, I think, is unfounded First of all, the headlines, I'm sure, tomorrow, and unfair. unfortunately, will read in many parts of the State that Illinois General Assembly has bailed out the public schools of the City of Chicago, and nothing could be further from the truth. will not find one dime of State money in this proposal. It is not a bailout. There are some who would have liked for us to forgive the four-some million dollars that the audit recently found that the Chicago was -- public schools weren't in compliance. There were some who wanted to forgive that. Our Leader, both on the Second Floor in the Governor, and our Leader here, and I'm sure Leader Daniels in the House, said no. No State money is going to be utilized for this program. Now, we fought hard on this side of the aisle in Education Committee and many of the Members here for a lot of reforms that many of you over there opposed. Well, didn't get all the reforms and the work rule changes that we wanted, but there's some changes in here that we think will make a meaningful difference by which the education process will take public schools of Chicago, especially the in the principal-in-charge issue, which most of us downstate find totally incomprehendible, how a principal in a school building cannot in charge of his facility. In this language, it puts perfect -makes perfect explanation that the principal truly is in charge. The Inspector General is something that we felt is important from this side of the aisle. We feel that maybe some schools in

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

Chicago should close. We feel that maybe some real estate from the public schools of Chicago should be sold, and we're asking the Inspector General to do that very thing: to review and make available to the General Assembly a report that will hopefully address the issue that most of us here are concerned about, and that's the third year, the so-called "cliff". Now having said that, I'd like to ask the sponsor, if I might, a question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Sponsor says he will yield.

SENATOR WATSON:

Senator Berman, is it true that the School Board under this legislation can call and hold a special election anytime between January 1st, 1995 and May 31st, 1995, for the purpose of increasing the Education Fund tax rate? Is that true?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Yes, sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you. And if the Board fails to call for the election before January 1st of 1995, we now are giving the City Council the authority to call a special election anytime between June 1st, 1995 and July 1st, 1995. Is that true?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeANGELIS)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Yes, sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

Thank you, Senator Berman. I've attempted to get a letter some indication from Sharon Grant, the School Board President of Chicago public schools. In that letter, I am asking that adamantly support the referendum concept. I am told that she does. I do not have a letter in hand and hope I will have. Hopefully tomorrow in the executive meeting of the Chicago Board of Education, this will be on the agenda. I am told it is and will be discussed, about the referendum issue. I've worked closely, and the Education Committee in this Senate, and, Berman, you also, with the Chicago Board of Education, but I want to tell you that if they don't put the referendum on the ballot in 1995, I'm going to have a tough time working with the Chicago Board of Education, because all we're asking the people of Chicago to do is to do what every other school district in this State has to do, and that's ask the people of their districts for support. Now, I understand this hasn't been done since Johnson -- President Johnson was in administration. I find that unconscionable. Every other school district in this State goes to the people in a referendum, and I hope the Chicago Board of Education will that this Senate, and especially the people on this side of the aisle and the concern that they have for the ability of the people of the City to voice their support for the Chicago public schools, before they come back to us for one, single dime. That's the issue over here that divides us. That's the problems we have here, is that every other district in this State goes to Chicago should be no different. But I support this the people. legislation, and I support the efforts that put this together. And I want to tell you, one of the previous speakers said that we about the four hundred and eleven could care less Well, if we don't do something tonight, children of Chicago. And what will the Chicago those people are on the streets. Tribune read on Tuesday in their "Death of the Children" column

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

when somebody's killed because they weren't in school? We have a responsibility here to make sure that doesn't happen, and I hope that we'll do it. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator -- Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I have a question regarding page 17 of the amendment, and I've been told that Senator Watson would be able to answer the question because the language comes from the Republican-sponsored bill that went over to the House, and it's language regarding the powers of the School Finance Authority.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Watson, do you choose to answer the question? What is the question, Senator del Valle?

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Senator Watson, my interpretation of this language that allows the —— the Authority to assure the completion of assessments and analyses that look at potential cost savings and efficiency that the Board can achieve through consolidation of attendance centers and the operations of buildings — you made mention of that just a few minutes ago — my understanding of this language is that the Authority will recommend to the Board actions to take related to the savings, and that if the Board does not take action, then it must indicate why, and if the Authority is not satisfied with the Board's explanation, then they can withhold their support or reject the budget for Fiscal Year 1995 of the Board, in effect, forcing the Board to close schools, if that's what the School Finance Authority recommends. Is that also your interpretation of this language?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

Well, yes, it is, Senator, and I think that what we're asking here is a review. And especially since there's been a -- a drop in enrollment in Chicago public schools, there may be a possibility that actual schools could be closed, and that's what we're asking for here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeANGELIS)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

So then, the intent here is to give the School Finance Authority the power to close schools.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Let me just ask a question back, Senator. Are you talking about individual school buildings? I mean, that... Or are you talking about the system as a whole?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeANGELIS)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

The analysis indicates that the School Finance Authority can take action. If you'll look at Section (c)(2), it says, the potential cost savings and efficiencies that the Board can achieve through the consolidation of attendance centers..." And to say, "...the Authority shall make then i t goes on recommendations to the Board regarding...changes that derive And then, "In conjunction with its assessments..." budgetary submission to the Authority for the fiscal year ending in 1995, the Board shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Authority that the recommendations requested by the Authority have been implemented.... In consideration of whether to approve or reject the budget for the fiscal year that ends '95, the Authority adjudge whether the Board has fully considered and shall

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

responsibly proposed implementation of the Authority's recommendations."

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, inadvertently, I don't -- I don't know, but you didn't read all of what was the language there. And it says, "implemented in whole or in part of <sic> (or), in the alternative..." I mean, what we're saying here is, in fact, yes, that we are asking for recommendations, and we are not necessarily saying that it is a mandate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeANGELIS)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

just want the -- the record to show that there is concern about this language and that my interpretation is that it does give the School Finance Authority an additional power, and that is one of my concerns, generally speaking, and that is the additional powers that we're granting the School Finance Authority. feeling is that if we're going to rely so much on the School Finance Authority, then why don't we make the School Finance Authority a statewide authority and subject every school district State of Illinois to the same rigorous kinds of requirements that we're subjecting the Chicago School District? I don't understand why we don't take that action. I also feel strongly about the fact that we are using Chapter 1 dollars. And while I thank our Minority Leader for the changes that he made in this bill and for the battle that he has fought to save Chapter 1, the fact is that back in 1988, we passed school reform legislation and it was a revenue-neutral bill, and five years later we are going to take from the schools an amount that was promised five years ago. So not only are we not fulfilling that promise, we are

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

also saying that - according to you, Senator Watson - that if additional reforms that you want to see aren't implemented, we are not going to give the System one more dime. Let me remind you, Senator Watson, that we haven't given the System one more dime since school reform was started. We haven't given the System And yet, all kinds of changes have occurred, one more dime. structural changes have occurred, and yet, we haven't dealt with the real issue and that is the need for additional State support. The lifeblood of school reform has not been our actions here in the General Assembly in the way of structural change. lifeblood of school reform was what we did with Chapter 1 in terms the five-year phase-in. So let's -- let's be realistic here. Let's understand what is really on the table here. This, indicated, is not a bailout, and I'm glad it's been said and I'm glad the Governor said it and I'm glad everyone's finally saying it. This is not a bailout. This is giving Chicago public schools permission to dig its financial debt hole even bigger than what it We're not doing a thing for the Chicago public schools. But we've run out of track here. And by design, Now our backs are up against the wall. We run out of track. either do this now or kids don't go to school tomorrow. beautiful plan. I commend the architects of this plan not because it's a good plan, but because strategically you have won - you have won. You have allowed this Body, once again, to be able say to the public that we have helped the Chicago public schools, and in actuality, we have done nothing. As a matter of fact, are going backwards, quickly. But we've run out of track, and so we are forced to take what is on the table, and what is on the table is about as lousy as you can get.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeANGELIS)

May I remind the Members that there are still many people that want to speak. Please keep your comments to a minimum. Senator

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you, Mr. President, and I'll be brief. The reforms in this bill are a step in the right direction. No raid on the Teachers' Retirement Fund is fiscally responsible. But what this issue boils down to, at the cliff, in two years, is who's going to pay back the four hundred and twenty-seven million dollars. Will it be Chicago taxpayers in property taxes, like everyone else in the State, or will it be Illinois taxpayers in a future income tax increase, when the cliff comes? The fatal flaw to this bill is that there's no mandatory property tax referendum. Here it is, simply stated in this morning's Chicago Tribune: "Why don't Chicagoans just raise taxes and bail out their own schools? The answer, a variety of experts say, is that they could but they probably won't." They won't. I urge a No vote on this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

Thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield? It's a question for Senator Berman, I believe.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeANGELIS)

Sponsor says he will yield.

SENATOR SHAW:

Okay. On the Inspector General, could you tell me what will be the Inspector General's duties after he's appointed, Senator Berman?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Just one second. I'm trying to find the appropriate... The Inspector General shall have the authority to conduct investigations into allegations of or incidents of waste, fraud,

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

and financial mismanagement in the public schools. He will have the power, or she will have the power, to subpoen witnesses and compel the production of -- of books. It requires the Inspector General to annually issue reports of any investigations that the Inspector General undertakes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

Well, will they -- will the Inspector General have the power to look into if there's any -- any abuse of Chapter 1 funds?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeANGELIS)

Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

To the -- to the bill: Certainly this bill leave a lots to be desired, but thinking in terms of the -- what the alternative is, I rise in support of this bill. And I think it's important to note, they say no one speaks for the children, but I think it's important for the children of Chicago to get whatever education that they can get, by making sure that the doors of the schools are open tomorrow. And I think anything short of that, even with the shortcomings of this bill, would be doing a total disservice to the young people of Chicago. I've sat, and -- I've sat, I've listened to many pros and many cons. Certainly, out of the eleven years that I've been -- served in this Body, some in House and now in the Senate, I think I've spent a full year here dealing with this, basically educational, problem, and I what we are doing here this evening will give some stability to the mothers and fathers of those youngsters in Chicago that

November 14, 1993

wonder, week by week and day by day, whether their children is going to be able to continue school. And I think we have a responsibility in this Body to make sure that the doors of the schools stay open. A few weeks ago the courts kept the It was our responsibility then. It's our responsibility now. And certainly the State is not spending any money. just allowing the Board of Education to do -- to spend the money that's already allocated for Chicago. And I think it's -- I have to commend the Leaders, and particularly Senator Jones, who have worked tireless hours on this, and many times, when I talked to him, he'd tell me, say, "Well, I don't have time now." And say, "I've got to go and deal with education." But he worked long and hard on this for the children of Chicago. And I think that if we don't vote for this bill -- and we can make all of the speeches that we want about how bad it is and what's wrong with it. Certainly a lot's wrong with it. We must put the children first, and we should vote Yes on this bill. I ask for a Aye vote on the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I'd like to -- I have a question, but what I'd like to do is -- is just to get a couple of points in first.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

State your point.

SENATOR RAICA:

First of all, when -- I find it very hard to understand why someone would stand up on the Floor and -- and say that we just received a package of a very important nature and we didn't have time to take a look at it, when this has probably been the topic of conversation for maybe the last four to six weeks. Our Leader,

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

every time he came back from the Governor's Office or came back from talking to House Speaker Madigan, or Senator Jones, called a caucus and informed us of everything that was discussed and what he was able to ascertain or receive, what we had to -concessions on, and kept us abreast daily of what was going on. Even when we were back at our district offices or at home, Senator Senator del Valle made Philip made sure he had staff call us. comments about the School Finance Authority, particularly that they may have too much power. I guess one of the questions -- or one of the points Senator del Valle tried to make was: they have so much authority? Why them specifically? think that answer's pretty easy to see, and that's because there is no other school district here in Springfield threatening to It's the Chicago School System that's threatening to shut down, not Rockford, although they're in need, or any of the other school districts throughout the State of Illinois. School District 117, in my district and Senator O'Malley's district, where repeatedly referendums were on the ballot for tax increases, and only this year was the first time that it passed in over seven So that's one of the reasons that probably a School Finance Authority is a good idea. For any Member of this General Assembly to stand and say there is no waste, there is nothing illegal going on in the Chicago School System, I think that would be totally inappropriate. Secondly, for those, I would imagine, on our side of the aisle, who consider themselves to be fiscally responsible, unfortunately this is not the bill to take a political stance on. We're talking about four hundred and ten thousand -- four hundred and eleven thousand school kids City of Chicago that are going to be out if the General Assembly does not act today, as the House did. One issue that this does not address, and that is, parents. The crime rate that's in the -- in the public school system -- this does not ensure that

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

the parents are going to be good parents. So for those of you who think that this bill can't and has nothing to do with cutting crime in the City of Chicago schools, you're right; it probably doesn't. That's what parents are for. And I don't know if we can sit here and discuss the merits of crime in the Chicago schools, particularly with this bill. Those of you who are using Chapter 1 money as possibly an excuse not to vote for this particular piece of legislation, unless I am wrong, there has been twenty million dollars' worth of Chapter 1 money from this year and last year which has not been spent. The schools are supposedly going receive another thirty-four million dollars next year, which we will withhold sixteen million, if I'm not mistaken, and we will give them eighteen million, which means they will have fifty-eight million dollars of Chapter 1 money, forty of which has not been spent. So for us to use Chapter 1 money as an excuse not to vote for this bill, I think is ludicrous, at best, and harms the children of the City of Chicago. Chapter 1 money is not an excuse. All I can see as being an excuse is politics - pure politics. Someone's waiting to get something out of this bill, or someone's waiting to get something from the Governor's Office, so everyone's going to hold out. Senator Berman and Senator Jones and the people on that side of the aisle have worked very hard. Senator Pate Philip, John Maitland, Senator Watson have worked very hard on this side of the aisle, likewise the Members of the House of Representatives. The referendum was a very important issue on this side of the aisle, but we compromised, just as the Democrats compromised on a lot of their issues. No one is sitting here saying that this is the best - best - package ever put together, but, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, this is the only package today. Speaker Madigan and Lee Daniels did their part and passed it out of the House of Representatives. There's four hundred and eleven thousand schoolchildren waiting to go back to

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

school tomorrow. Regular Session starts January 12th, Ladies and Gentlemen. If you want and are very sincere about school reforms, that's the time to talk about politics, if you will, but don't keep four hundred and eleven kids from going -- or, four hundred and eleven thousand kids from going to school tomorrow, to play politics. That's the wrong thing to do. Although I only have six percent of the City of Chicago, at one time I did represent forty-five percent of the City of Chicago. I'm not going to let those six percent of my district down today; therefore, I'll be voting Aye on this package.

END OF TAPE

TAPE 2

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Farley.

SENATOR FARLEY:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I think sometimes we become too close to a situation, to a problem, to a crisis. I think this is an instance where we have to stand back and look, not as those that are standing here dealing with the technical aspects of this problem, but of a real outlook on what this means to four hundred and eleven thousand children, to their parents and to all of those that would be affected by this possible shutdown. According to the analysis that I received and in my conversation with people back in my district, the analysis, and my conversation, talks about an Inspector General monitoring Board expenditures and practices. I see nothing wrong with that. The people in my district see

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

It talks about audits of the Board every nothing wrong with that. two years, talks about fiscal responsibility, talks principals being in charge. It talks about moving a date for the Board's budget, from August 15th -- or, to August 15th. These are changes, changes that I think are positive - solution to an ongoing problem that will be ongoing unless we attack some of these problems right now. It was also explained to me that borrowing is in fact -- that the borrowing, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen, in fact, is a cheaper way to go with bonds pension program. Now, to me, that's fiscal the responsibility. If we go back to our districts and tell people what this really does, in laymen's language, I don't think anybody is going to criticize us for voting Yes on this proposal because of one item or another item. Let me touch upon Chapter 1 money, Mr. President. According to a chart that I district receives the most money of Chapter 1 funds. Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, going to go back to my district tomorrow and tell these children that are entitled to this increase in Chapter 1 money that I didn't think it was enough, that I didn't think that one part of this proposal was good enough to have the school doors open and for receive that increase, or for them to not be able to walk through those school doors and get an education. I think, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, that this proposal is a meaningful step in the right direction, is a meaningful proposal that will get the schools open tomorrow, that will allow us to attack a long and more difficult problem of resolving school and education, and work rule changes, and principal problems and concerns, and school board problems and concerns, the next couple of years. Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House <sic>, I would be very happy if all of those that agree with me would be voting Aye and we pass this measure.

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Stern.

SENATOR STERN:

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, you may recall that I returned from Turkey at the summons of my Governor to attend the Special Session, and to cast the vote, which it appears I shall finally get to cast tonight. I really rise to object to the process. This is the first time I have heard this subject debated on the Floor. As Senator Raica pointed out, yes, we have had access to our Leaders in caucus, and that has been very helpful. But would it not have been more helpful to have had a Committee of the Whole to discuss some of the proposals that were before the -the five gentlemen who were making the important decisions? would have liked that. I think the public would have liked that. I think we are fortunate that Judge Kocoras set a final date of November 15th; otherwise, this would have gone on probably indefinitely, with youngsters not knowing where they would be from one week to the next. I have waited nearly ten weeks to cast a vote for the children of Chicago. I am happy to cast it now, I hope you will all join me and we'll get this thing going.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeANGELIS)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I, too, shall be brief. About a month ago, I said to this Body: Why are we here? The Governor called a Special Session, specifically for one school district in Illinois, and I think that's been the problem that I've had with this manner in which this has been handled all along, that we are addressing one school district in Illinois, and we are not addressing any of the other school districts in this State. But I guess collective bargaining has worked because we are back here again tonight,

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

trying to ratify an agreement that has been adopted by the School Board and also the Teachers' Union, and the four Leaders and the Governor. Senator Raica, I don't want to subject downstate school districts to the provisions of this bill, but I am willing to provide my vote to get this compromise extracted so that the kids of Chicago don't miss school. If the School Finance Authority was applicable statewide, four hundred downstate school districts this year would not have opened their doors. I wouldn't want to subject them to the balanced budget amendment; I wouldn't want to subject them to the Inspector General, and I certainly wouldn't want give them the authority to borrow. But this, as Frank Watson has indicated, is certainly not a bailout, because, in fact, there There are no Pension Fund diversions or State money. borrowing. There's no State quarantee for bonds. There's no State money at all. But I will say that I think that we missed a big opportunity in this Session of the General Assembly, since we have been here so long. I think we missed an opportunity to tell the hundred and eleven, or thereabouts, school districts in this State that are on the Financial Watch List - Chicago, of course, not being one of them - that the General Assembly is interested in addressing their equally important financial concerns, Yes, this proposal is an ugly proposal, we all said and agree that it is. I'm surprised that in this Special Session, long as we have been here, that we haven't considered the bipartisan efforts of the School Finance Authority. It's been around for a couple of years. Senator Berman and Senator Maitland deal of time into that effort, but hasn't have put a great happened. So we haven't really addressed the long-range problems of school funding in Illinois. We are giving that Band-Aid And I've been around approach to Chicago's problems this evening. long enough to know that if this doesn't pass tonight, this ugly proposal, as it is before us, that the next one will be ugly, as

November 14, 1993

well. And if that one doesn't pass, it'll be ugly, as well, the third proposal. Now some scholars may say that if this ugly proposal doesn't pass the first time, that the second one will probably be uglier, and the third one will probably be the ugliest. So, we are, tonight, having to deal with this ugly I'm willing to provide my support to get this crisis behind us. But I will tell you this, the school districts across Illinois, I think, next year, when there is a gubernatorial election, will expect a Special Session for them also, about the inequities in education in Illinois, to talk about the disparity of twelve hundred dollars per student, in the -- in more -- in the poorer districts to the more affluent districts of fourteen thousand dollars. That's the real issue in Illinois. I'm rising, Mr. President, to support this proposal this evening. I've seen some uglier ones in my nineteen It's an ugly one. years, but this is ugly enough. And I think that it's time for us to put the proper requisite number of votes on the board and afford the Chicago School System the opportunity to solve their own problems before it costs us any more money.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator LaPaille.

SENATOR LaPAILLE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I do rise in support of this compromise. And I want to compliment the four legislative Leaders — I think several speakers have said that already — Senator Philip, Senator Jones, Speaker Madigan, Representative Daniels, for the long hours that they've put in. They've been here when we've been at home. They've been here on Friday evenings; they've been here on Saturdays; they've been here on Sundays. And I'd also like to compliment the Governor, because I too believe that at some point, Friday or so, he had to tell people, this was it. And he did provide that leadership, to say it's over, and this is

November 14, 1993

what we're going to go with. So I do rise to compliment him. this was a very, very difficult problem. For people that observed the legislative process for many years, you may say, like me, that this, perhaps, was one of the most difficult to face the Legislature in a decade or more. But the four Leaders and the Governor did reach a compromise. Is everyone happy? No. But that's not the art of compromise, to make everyone happy. On our side we wanted to protect collective bargaining process and worker rights. We have accomplished that goal. On your side, you wanted school reform and oversight. You have accomplished that goal. all sides should be complimented for sticking to their But two other groups should also be singled out principles. the Chicago classroom teachers, who for three months went to work without a contract and gave a hundred and ten percent of themselves to teach our children in Chicago, not knowing if they would work the next day, not knowing if they would be laid off, not knowing if they would be terminated or have their salary cut, or pay higher pension costs or health care costs, working longer hours, or teaching more students. But they went to work for three long months, not knowing what would happen. And I do believe that the unsung heroes in all of this are the Chicago schoolchildren, who went to school every day, not knowing if they would be going to school the next day, not knowing who would take care of them the next day if the schools were to close, not knowing if they would be in the same school or transfer to a different school, not knowing if they would have their courses cut their classrooms consolidated. They truly are the unsung heroes in this issue. So tonight, I think we need to pass this plan, this compromise, for the Chicago schoolchildren and to close a very, very bad chapter in education funding in Illinois. strongly support this compromise and urge its passage.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. There are fifty-nine men and women in this Body. have so much respect for the Illinois State Senate. I've debated on this Floor for now into my fifteenth year. The fifty-nine individuals that sit here tonight have varying points of view. are intelligent. We understand our district, and we try to represent our district as best we can. We are both parochial are global in our view. I have repeatedly, in my years here, tried to make that point, and I have worked with both sides of the aisle, urban and rural. And on this issue, indeed, there were varying points of view. And we have debated the issue long and hard, and tonight is no exception. It is my personal view that had the Federal Court not intervened in this problem, we would have been out of here a long time ago. That was not to be. Nonetheless, the debate persists. It is not a perfect plan, but if you have followed what we have done in elementary and secondary education since 1985, slow as it may be, varying points of view as we have, we continue to move forward. And, Senator Demuzio, day soon we'll resolve that last piece of the puzzle, and I hope and pray that happens very soon. I too thank those who have been involved in the discussions, in the long hours of debate, because they have been long hours. And I've also had conversations with the Lieutenant Governor of this State, who also has been involved in the discussions and, frankly, worked with Senator Jones, on one occasion, with some of the reform groups. And we might just mention the fact that there are a number of them, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, who aren't one hundred percent delighted about this package, but recognize it as a step in the right direction. The United Neighborhoods Organization - UNO; the Chicago Urban League, a very large, large group, who believes

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

strongly in education are on board; Citizens School Committee; Leadership for Quality Education, to name just four. Ladies and Gentlemen, we continue to move forward, and I urge your support of Senate Bill 132.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. I believe the issues as relate to Senate Bill 132 have been thoroughly debated, and we have reached the crossroads as it relate children of the Chicago public schools. It is a point that I did not want to reach at this late day in the year. I tried to get this issue resolved in July during regular Session. I suggested then that we should do the borrowing, as we are now doing the borrowing with SFA, and we would not be faced with the crisis that we are faced with today. But, unfortunately, we couldn't come to an agreement on such, so here we are, at the crossroads. choose the path, as some have suggested, and vote against this bill, the four hundred and ten thousand students, their parents them in school, the anxieties that they have been going through for the past weeks, you vote No, the schools do not open. If we choose another path, though not perfect, the schools will open tomorrow. I recognized that during the long periods of negotiations, that in my twenty years here, I have never seen the perfect bill. And there will never be a perfect bill. There are many provisions in this piece of legislation that I don't like. But I recognize in the legislative process, you've got individuals from downstate, you've got farmers, you've got Republicans, you've got Democrats. If each individual in this Body would only here and think about their only little niche, no legislation would pass and we would be in a constant logjam. The meetings that we've had - Senator Philip, myself, Lee Daniels, and Mike Madigan,

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

and the Governor - were meetings that were an attempt to bring all the forces together to get the necessary votes to aid the children of the -- of the Chicago Public School System. This bill is not a perfect bill by no one's imagination. It is does not change the rank of Illinois from being forty-eighth out of fifty states funding public education. It does not stop the shell game from when we put money in through the Lottery and through the riverboats for education and put less in from General Revenue. doesn't stop that shell game. This doesn't change the fact that a hundred and twelve school districts in this State in precarious conditions financially are on the Financial Watch List. doesn't change that. But it will permit the students of the City of Chicago to go to school, so they don't have -- so they don't have to worry about whether I will be there to fill out the papers or make my application to college, will I get enough courses in so I can graduate. I've heard much, and much discussed as relate to State Chapter 1 dollars. And I resent - I resent - the lies, the innuendos, by those outside the Chamber as it relate to these dollars. It took me fifteen long years to reach this point, to see to it that the children in the City of Chicago have targeted funds. I had the Board do a printout of every school in the City of Chicago. Ninety-nine percent of the principals didn't even know they were getting an increase in Chapter 1 dollars, not And to hear the debate on the Floor about taking from, I have it here in black and white. If you've got hundred thousand dollars in Chapter 1 this year -- I mean, last year, and instead of going up to six hundred thousand, you go up to five fifty this year, and six hundred or more next year, you have an increase. You have an increase - in a system that does any money. And we are rearranging the financial have so that schools can remain open. I have the same concerns that each of you have, but I feel it's the obligation to

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

Percentile - I can go legislative district by tell the truth. legislative district, about the percent of increase, not decrease. I won't call your names, but -- but those percents range anywhere from 3.5 all the way up to sixteen and seventeen percent increase in supplemental funds to meet the needs of the children We are not, by no stretch of the from disadvantaged families. imagination, taking the other dollars that you already have. school districts got twenty-one million, twenty million, twenty-three million, twenty-three -- twenty-nine million dollars So you get an increase. in supplemental funds. five million dollars again, you get two and a half this getting year and two and a half next year. No legislation is perfect. But our duty is to see that those children go to school tomorrow not play the rah, rah, rah, silly games. If the schools do not open tomorrow, how in the heck are you going to go back and say, I'm holding out because I want a bigger increase"? If the sixteen million dollars that we are talking about, that they want, those same sixteen million dollars are spent systemwide. they are spent systemwide, even the Chapter 1 students receive the We have an obligation to tell the people the such. benefit of truth, not play to those silly games. So it was hard, hard work. I don't want to be in this posture. I resent it, but I feel it's our obligation as legislators to come together to do what we feel is necessary for the quarter of a million -- I mean, for a quarter -- twenty-five percent of the students in the State of Illinois. All schools in this State have problems. If every school had to meet the same fiscal balanced budget requirement that the City of Chicago has to meet, over half of them probably wouldn't even The State of Illinois, for example - if it had to meet the balanced budget requirement, it would not be able to pay a billion five hundred million dollars that it owe. But we're not talking about reform to the -- for the State. We're not talking about

November 14, 1993

that. But as one from Chicago, as one who have craft this package — which I do not like, but it is my duty to the children; it's my duty to the parents — the responsible vote is a Yes vote. That is the only vote one can justify on this issue. A responsible vote is a Yes vote. And I encourage the Members on this side, I encourage the Members on that side of the aisle, it should receive a unanimous vote — simply because not one dime, not one penny comes out of the State coffers. It is no bailout. But one day, Ladies and Gentlemen, one day, your schools will be looking for the same identical thing, and what are you going to call it then? I encourage a Yes vote on Senate Bill 132.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILLIP:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I think we ought to stand back and look at a historical perspective on why are we here again. Every two or three years when the school contract comes up, we're down here arguing about And as you know, it's the only the City of Chicago schools. school system in the State of Illinois that is appointed by That mayor, whoever he or she has been, for the past thirty or forty years, has appointed people who are pro-labor, pro-union. You have a pro-union school board dealing with unions. And what happens? After thirty or forty years of negotiations -and you compare the City of Chicago School System with Detroit, New York, Los Angeles, the big systems - they're the second highest paid teachers in the United States: thirty-eight thousand eighty-seven dollars. They teach a hundred and eighty-one days a year. They pay one percent of their retirement; we pay eleven and a half. They pay nothing towards their medical benefits. They're out of whack; they're out of line. I'm going to refresh your memory, particularly the other side of the aisle, back in 1990 or

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

1991, the last term of Thompson. As you know, the mayor appointed A lawyer by the name of Singer. an interim school board. that was just about the time that Secretary Bennett toured the City of Chicago schools and at a luncheon or a dinner, stated, in his opinion, that it was the worst school system in the United States. Now, very honestly, I think that was an exaggeration. isn't the worst. It certainly is not the best, but it doesn't do a very good job. Everybody saw it; everybody heard it; everybody criticized it. Within thirty days after that statement, Singer's interim school board passed a twenty-one percent pay increase for Not too much comment in -- in the press. The the teachers. interesting thing is, they didn't have any money. So what did they do? And, of course, your Party nothing. controlled the House and the Senate, and they came down here to Springfield with a scheme. What a wonderful scheme. seventy-five million dollars a year for three years to pay for the pav increases. Their scheme was, take sixty-five million dollars from the Pension Fund. We have never, in the history of the State of Illinois, ever taken money from any fund to pay for pension the operation of any government. Secondly, they said, "Well, take ten million dollars from the The Sun-Times was -- was writing those articles Building Fund." on how bad repair the City of Chicago schools were. Now that ten million from the Building Fund was forever. At least the Pension Fund was only for the term of the contract: three years. As know, we had twenty-eight Republicans in those days. Very proud to tell you, not one Republican voted for that so-called bailout. You passed it. Our old Governor, Jim Thompson, would probably tell you today, "It's one of the worst bills that I signed when I was Governor." He signed it; it became law. What did we do once again? We dug the hole a little deeper. So, here we are again. hope that we've learned something over the years. Let me

November 14, 1993

have been working long and hard on this compromise. want to compliment the Governor and his staff. For him -- if wouldn't have interceded, this thing would have been down the drain at least two or three times. And compliment our staff, other legislative Leaders. This is not an easy compromise by any stretch of the imagination. It is a compromise. Is it perfect? Absolutely not. Is it the best compromise we could do under these In my judgment, it is. Fact: no State money at circumstances? all - none. It is no bailout. It's never been a bailout. not taking any money from the Pension Fund. Talk to the teachers. to the retirees. Not one cent from the Pension Fund. We're allowing them to issue three hundred and seventy-eight million dollars' worth of bonds for a fourteen-year period. Do I like that? No, I don't. But I don't know another way of opening up the schools. If anybody else can figure it out -- we've been working on it for four months; we couldn't find another way open up the schools. Fact: Inspector General, subpoena powers, able to ask for audits, patterned after the City of Chicago and the New York school system. Fact: principals in charge. We're We're going to finally let somebody run those schools. going to It's long, long, long finally have a boss in the schools. overdue. Fact: We're going to be able to change work rules with fifty-one percent of the people voting, not seventy-one percent, not 63.5 percent - fifty-one percent. Fact: Supernumeraries are finally gone. Well, may I say this: It is a good package. reform in the true sense of the word. You know, we have some very good teachers in the City of Chicago; we have some very schools, and we have four hundred and eleven thousand kids that want to go to school. Let's put thirty-six votes up there and let 'em go back to school.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Jacobs, to close.

November 14, 1993

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. First of all, let me thank the Chair for its parliamentary leniency, and to thank Senator Berman for handling the debate on this issue. He's worked long and hard on that, has <sic> all Senators in this case. And thank God, the mutual admiration society exercise is over so we can get on with the vote of this bill. As you know and if -- you -- you have heard, the quality of this bill is debatable, but one thing is not debatable, and that is that our kids cannot learn if they're not in school. So let's send our kids to school tomorrow in Chicago, and I ask that we concur in House Amendment No. 1 and No. 4 to Senate Bill 132. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

This is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments 1 and 4 to Senate Bill 132. Those in favor shall vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 37 Ayes, 19 Nays, 1 voting Present. The Senate does concur in House Amendments 1 and 4 to Senate Bill 132, and the bill, having received the required three-fifths majority, is declared passed. Resolutions.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Joint Resolution 5, offered by Senator Weaver.

(Secretary reads SJR No. 5)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeANGELIS)

Senator Weaver moves to suspend the Rules for the purpose of the immediate consideration and adoption of those -- of Senate Resolution <sic> 5. Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would move for the immediate consideration and adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 5.

29th Legislative Day

November 14, 1993

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeANGELIS)

Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, say Nay. The Ayes have it.

The Rules are suspended. Senator Weaver, to explain your motion.

Senator Weaver now has moved for the...

SENATOR WEAVER:

I would move adoption of the resolution.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEANGELIS)

Senator Weaver has now moved for the adoption of Senate Resolution <sic> 5. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, say Nay. The Ayes have it, and the motion is adopted. The Senate stands adjourned SINE DIE.

REPORT:	TIFLDAY
PAGE: 0	01

STATE OF ILLINOIS 88TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

94/11/29 14:02:51

SENATE DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX SPECIAL SESSION # 1

NOVEMBER 14, 1993

SB-0132	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	4
CID OOOC	A D O D T C D	DACE	⊏ 11

28-0132	CONCURRENCE	5	PHGE	4
SJR-0005	ADOPTED		PAGE	54
SJR-0005	RESOLUTION	OFFERED	PAGE	53

BOK-0009 KEBOE0110K Ott BRED	r man	23
SUBJECT MATTER		
SENATE TO ORDER-PRESIDENT PHILIP	PAGE	1
PRAYER-SENATOR GEO-KARIS	PAGE	1
JOURNALS-APPROVED	PAGE	1
JOURNALS-POSTPONED	PAGE	1
AT EASE	PAGE	2
SENATE RECONVENES	PAGE	2
· MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE	PAGE	2
AT EASE	PAGE	3
SENATE RECONVENES	PAGE	3
MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT	PAGE	3
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	4
ADJOURNMENT-SINE DIE	PAGE	54